

205

A N
A N S W E R
T O S O M E
E X C E P T I O N S
I N
B I S H O P B U R N E T's
Third Part of the
HISTORY of the REFORMATION, &c.
A G A I N S T
M r. C O L L I E R's
Ecclesiastical History.

Together with
A R E P L Y to some R E M A R K S in Bishop
N I C H O L S O N's English Historical Library, &c. upon the
same Subject.

By J E R. C O L L I E R, M. A.



L O N D O N:

Printed for RICHARD SARE, JOHN NICHOLSON, BENJAMIN TOOK, DANIEL MID-
WINTER and GEORGE STRAHAN. 1715.

AN
ANSWER
TO SOME
EXCEPTIONS
IN
BISHOP BURNET'S

Third Part of the
HISTORY of the REFORMATION, &c.

Mr. COLLIER'S
Eccelesiastical History.

Together with
A REPLY to some REMARKS in Bishop
Burnet's History of the English Reformation, &c. upon the
same Subject.



By J. COLLIER, M.A.



LONDON:
Printed for Richard Smith, John Richardson, Benjamin Tooke, Daniel Mallet,
Wentworth and George Sturges, 1725.



AN ANSWER TO SOME EXCEPTIONS IN Bishop Burnet's

Third Part of the
HISTORY of the REFORMATION, &c.



These Papers being written before Bishop Burnet's Death, the Reader is desired to take them as they were.

The learned Author of the *History of our English Reformation*, has in his third part lately publish'd, made some Animadversions on the second Volume of my *Ecclesiastical History*.^a What he has offer'd upon this Subject is so gentle and inoffensive in the Proof, that at first I was unresolv'd about an Answer: But considering he is pleas'd to question my Integrity in no small Instance, and charge me with unfair Representation: That I fit hard on the Memory of our reforming Princes, and varnish the Character of those of a different Persuasion. Since he has given the Reader

Warning of my Book, for fear it might infect his Orthodoxy, and lead him into some dangerous Mistakes: These things consider'd, I thought a few Pages, by way of return, might not be unnecessary: I say a few Pages, for as for any length of Vindication, he has given no manner of Occasion for't.

This learned Prelate offers four Instances to shew with what Principle, Spirit and Design I set out: And all these, by his Insinuation, are much out of Order.^b To examine these as they lie. Becket comes up first: And here I have asserted, that tho' this Archbishop's Conduct in his Dispute with King Henry II. was not altogether defensible, he was far however from being guilty of that gross Mismanagement with which he is charged. The Bishop's Remark is this: I will leave the Judgment that must be pass'd upon this Period to all who are in any sort acquainted with the History of that

A 2 Time c.

^a Bp. Burnet, *Hist. Reform.* Part III. Pref. p. 2. to p. 6.

^b Id. Pref. pag. 3.

^c Id. Pref.
pag. 3.

Time. As much as to say, the Relation is romantick, and clearly contrary to Matter of Fact. What I have advanced by way of

Mitigation for *Becket*, is taken from contemporary Authors of the best Authority; from *Hawden* and *Neuengange*; from *Quadrilogus* and *Gesta of Canterbury*. And does this Reverend Prelate produce any counter Testimony better than these? No. Does he offer any disproof from any Inconsistency in the Account, from any high Improbability in Situation or Circumstance? Nothing of this kind. He affords no more than bare Assertion for the Point. If we won't assign to *Becket* a better Belief, with against Evidence, and

take his Word for the Controversy; we must keep our old Opinion, for here's no Light let in to inform us farther.

^d Bp. Burnet's
Charge, p. 63.
An. 1714.

This learned Prelate at his *Triennial Visitation*, ^d after some other unsupported Remarks, makes the softening *Becket's Behaviour* one Article. And yet he's so frank as to confess he never read my *first Volume*; and yet there's a Reference of ten Pages to this History in my *second Volume*, to justify the softening objected, and that in the very Place cited by this learned Prelate. Now what incomprehensible Justice is it to give Sentence without hearing the Cause; to censure an Author without reading him; especially when he refers to Evidence, and points directly to a Defence?

But this learned Prelate had given a different Account of this Matter, and called in a very unfortunat *Vouchee*. ^e His Author is one *William Thomas*: This *Thomas* was a flaming Rebel, advis'd the assassinating Queen *Mary*, for which *Wyat* abhor'd him, stabb'd himself with a Pen-knife in the *Tower*, and justifi'd his Treason at his Execution. Now whether a Person of this Temper and Principles, who flatter'd the Memory of *Henry VIII.* ^f and wrote almost four hundred Years after *Becket's* time; whether, I say, the Report of such a Person as this ought to weigh down the Authority of eight or nine Historians who liv'd at the Time of the Transaction, had fair Opportunities of knowing the Truth, and lay under no exceptionable Character, I leave the Reader to judge. But notwithstanding *Becket* has a Discharge from the hardest Imputations, his whole Conduct does not pass without Dislike.

^g Stow Annal.
pag. 623. 4.
Hollinghead,
pag. 1104.

To mention something of the Dispute between King *Henry II.* and him: He is blamed for going upon insufficient Grounds in the Controversy. That possibly he overlook'd the later Constitutions in the *Theodosian* and *Justinian Codes*, or rested too much on the Canon Law, ^g That the Exemption of Clerks from the Civil Courts was no Right inseparable from their Order, but only a Privilege granted by the Crown. And therefore since the Parliament at *Clarendon* had revok'd this Concession, the Archbishop ought not to have insisted on it. ^h He is blam'd for fluctuating and Inconstancy, for engaging and retracting, and quitting the Kingdom without the King's leave. He is farther censur'd for refusing to return to his See upon the most advantageous Precedents, and the best Terms enjoy'd by any of his Predecessors: And for breaking

^g Collier, Eccl.
Hist. Vol. I.
p. 373.

^h Id. p. 374.

off the Accommodation only for being deny'd the *Kiss of Peace*. His Tenent, that the Civil Government receiv'd its Authority from the Church, is mark'd as a false Principle, and a grand Mistake. And lastly, His excommunicating the Archbishop of *York* for crowning the young King, and not waiting his Right at so nice a Juncture, is mark'd as unseemable Stillness. And now I hope 'tis pretty clear, that tho' I am willing to do Justice to every body, I was not bias'd with any Partiality to Archbishop *Becket*.

To proceed. This learned Prelate complains of my having represented King *Edward VI.* under a Character of Disadvantage. That he was tinctur'd with *Erastian Principles*, and seems to have had no Notion of Sacrilege; and that most of the Hardships put upon the Church, happen'd in the latter end of his Reign, when his Judgment was in the best Condition. ^k I grant all this is said; and for the Truth of the Remark, besides other Proof from History and Records, I vouch'd this Prince's Remains in the Cotton Library.

This learned Prelate being not prepar'd to disprove the Narrative, applies to another Expedient. He makes it a Fault, that these severe Reflections (as he calls them) are not corrected. This looks like impracticable Advice: For which way can Truth be corrected unless by delivering that which is false? But I conclude immediately with his Death, without adding a Word of his good Qualities. As to the bright part of this King's Character, I had given it to a considerable length just before; and to what purpose would it have been to have cloy'd the Reader with Repetition?

And here it may be farther consider'd, this Prince was deep in his Minority, not sixteen at his Death; and therefore all Misfortune in his Conduct and Principles, must fall upon those who form'd his Education, and govern'd his Person. Now that those who sway'd in the Court, and sat at the Helm, were not Men of Regularity, and stanch Conscienced, is largely confess'd by this Reverend Prelate. To produce some Instances: He reports a memorable ^m Passage from *Ridley's* Life. That when this Bishop had bestow'd a *Prebend* in *St. Paul's* upon *Grindall*, "He receiv'd a Letter from the Council to stop Collation: For the King was to keep that *Prebend* for the Furniture of his Stable." So that it seems the Horses made part of the Chapter. At the close of this Reign he observes, *The untimely End of this Prince was look'd on as a just Judgment of God, upon those who pretended to love and promote a Reformation; but whose impious and flagitious Lives were a Reproach to it. The open Lewdness in which many lived, without Shame or Remorse, gave great Occasion to their Adversaries to say, they were in the right to assert justification by Faith without Works, since they were; as to every good Work, Reprobate. Their gross and insatiable scrambling after the Goods and Wealth, that had been dedicated with good Designs, tho' to superstitious Uses, without applying any part of it to the promoting the Gospel, the instructing the Youth, or relieving the Poor, made all People conclude, that it was for Robbery, and not for Reformation, that their Zeal*

made

^m Bp. Burnet,
Part III.
p. 197.

Ibid.

^k Bp. Burnet,
Hist. Part. III.
pag. 3.

Ibid.

^a Id. Part III. made them so active ⁿ. To this he subjoyns an authentick Account of the Court's indirect Dealing with respect to the Deanary of Norwich.

Our learned Historian goes on, to lament the want of Probity and Christian Behaviour in the Politicians and Grand Monde, in a very solemn and tragical Strain. He ^o reports, These Men of Distinction Talk'd of the Purity of the Gospel, while they were wallowing in all Sensuality and Uncleaness; pretending to put all their Confidence in the Merits and Sufferings of Christ, while they were crucifying him afresh, and putting him to open Shame. That there was no redress of crying Abuses, to be expected from the Men in Power, because they found their Account too evidently in them. That these were Men in whose Hands things grew every Day worse and worse; whose Arrogance, and other Disorders, our chief Reformers were forc'd in some measure to connive at, that they might not provoke them to retard a Work, that could in no wise be carry'd on without their Countenance and Authority, tho' they saw the Prejudice it brought upon them to be oblig'd to apply to, and to make use of, such Tools. That the righteous Souls of our best Reformers were much griev'd to find themselves engag'd with Men that were ready to pull down, especially when any thing was to be got by it; but were as backward in building up, as They were forward in plucking down. So that They seem'd to design to leave all in a great Ruine. These were Hindrances to the progress of the Reformation, as they were both the Burthen, and the Shame of our Reformers. Our Author, in the Page before this,

* Id. p. 217. * has a great deal more to the same purpose. 'Tis true this Reverend Prelate confines the Mal-administration chiefly to the Beginning of this Reign, as if Matters mended upon the Course †: But this Account is quickly retracted, for in the next Leaf ‡ he recollects himself, and assures us, that Things grew every day worse and worse.

Now after all this Keennes and Length of Satyr, I desire he would please to recall his Censure, and not charge me with over-loading the Administration; and discovering a particular Virulence against the Memory of this Prince P.

His third Instance to discover the Mysterious Principles, and Design with which I wrote, relates to Mary Queen of Scots. The dangerous Words are These; Her Fortitude and Devotion were very remarkable: She supported her Character, with all imaginable Decency, and dyed like a Christian, and a Queen ^q.

And what harm is there in this? 'Tis no more than bare Justice to her Memory. Even Camden gives her a larger Commendation than this comes to: And which is more, Queen Elizabeth is deeply censured for breach of promise; for confining and maltreating this Princess: And lastly, for bringing an Independent Queen her Cousin; first to her Tryal, (where she had not the benefit of the Law,) and then to the Block ^r.

But Mary Queen of Scots was a Roman Catholick, therefore a good word is too much for Her. To what purpose else can this passage be cited? But this Learned Prelate was of another mind last Summer. For at the

Salisbury Visitation, He throws in a clause for candid Construction, and good Usage. He declares his Heart is full of personal Charity for Papists; ^s And thanks God for this benevolent Disposition. That He has known many Good Men amongst them, and loved them particularly. And since, within the Bishop's Acquaintance, many Papists are good Men, why might not this Queen of Scots be a good Woman, and a Princess of great Magnanimity, as Camden reports Her? And if so, tis pretty plain, Her Character is not over-flourish'd.

The last exceptionable Instance is taken from a short parallel, drawn between Queen Elizabeth, and her Sister Queen Mary, with Reference to the Church. And here this Learned Prelate, tho' he gives no reason for't, would have his Reader believe the Comparison leans too much to the Advantage of the latter ^t. To this I answer,

1st, The Parallel runs all by way of Quere, and nothing is directly asserted. My words stand thus: May it not be affirm'd the one made Martyrs in the Church, the other Beggars? The one executed the Men, and the other the Estates? And therefore reserving the Honour of the Reformation to Queen Elizabeth, the Question will be whether the Resuming the First Fruits and Tenths, putting many Vicarages in a deplorable Condition, and settling a perpetuity of poverty on the Church, was not much more prejudicial than Fire and Faggot? &c^u. Thus we see every Thing is put by way of Question, and refer'd to the Reader's Decision. And where nothing is affirm'd, one might have hoped, nothing would have been charg'd. But

2^{dly}, Supposing these Queres turn'd into Affirmations, which is more than the words will bear, are not the Facts undoubted, and the Inferences beyond contradiction? Is not Queen Mary said to have made Martyrs? And does the persecuting Truth, and burning People for Orthodoxy, come near a Commendation? The Honour of the Reformation is reserved for Queen Elizabeth: And is not this a remarkable Preference? on the other side, were not all the Improvements vested in the Crown, were not the First Fruits and Tenths, return'd by Queen Mary to the Church? This last our Learned Historian commends as a noble Instance of Bounty ^w. He likewise observes that Improvements are the True Patrimony of the Church, and that the granting them away, has put a great part of our Clergy under crying Necessities ^x.

And does not Queen Elizabeth's conduct fall under Disadvantage upon both these Considerations? Does not Poverty in the Clergy breed Ignorance and Contempt; call them off from their Business, and weaken their Character? And must not the Laity be losers in their Biggest Interest, and suffer deeply upon this score? without doubt they must, unless Christianity is an imposturous Contrivance, and Heaven and Hell no better than Romance. What Bishop of primitive Conscience and Courage would not willingly go to the Stake to rescue Religion from such a state of Impotence? Now that these crying Necessities were in a great measure brought upon the Church by Queen Elizabeth's Administration,

^s Bp. Burnet's Charge, p. 63.

^t Bp. Burnet, Pt. III. Pref. p. 3.

^u Collier's Eccl. Hist. Vol. II. p. 670. English Hist. Library. p. 169.

^w Bp. Burnet's Hist. Pt. III. p. 331.

^x Ibid.

^q Collier. Eccl. Hist. Vol. II. p. 601. Bp. Burnet, Pt. III. Pref. p. 3.

^r Camden. Eliz.

stration, is too evident to be deny'd: And to come somewhat closer, is sufficiently confessed by this Learned *Historian*. And therefore for ought any thing that has hitherto appear'd, I may have as disinterested and defensible a *Notion* of the *Happiness* or *Misery* of a *Church*, as this Reverend Prelate ⁷.

⁷ Bp. Burnet's *Church*, as this Reverend Prelate ⁷.
⁸ Pref. p. 4. This Learned Prelate proceeds to complain I have not done Him justice in denying the Difference between the *Ordinall* publish'd in King *Edw. VI.*'s Reign; and that now in use. * And for This He appeals to the first Edition of the *Ordinall*, in the *Lambeth Library*. I grant this is putting the Matter upon a fair Issue.

But here it may be observ'd He owns a *variation* between the *Lambeth print*, and the passages transcribed in his *History*; and which is more, He is so kind as to prove it ². And tho' He calls it a *small variation*, 'tis plain by his own Account, there are several solemn circumstances omitted.

² Id. *Hist. Ref.* Pt. II. Book I. p. 149. compared with *Hist. Ref.* Pt. III. Pref. p. 4. 2dly, There's not only omission, but contradiction, between the Reports of this matter. In the 2d Part of his *History* of the *Reformation*, This Learned Prelate affirms, ^a that by the first *Reform'd Ordinall*, there was nothing more in the Consecration of a Bishop, than what is now in use, save that a Staff was put into his Hand with this Blessing, **Be to the Flock of Christ a Shepherd.** But in the Preface to his 3d Part, ^b He tells us the Rubrick appoints the Archbishop to lay the Bible on the consecrated Bishop's Neck, and say give heed to Reading.

The *Ordinalls* perus'd by me were printed by Grafton and *Whitchurch*, in the year 1552. I thought them then the first Editions, but am now convinc'd there was an *Ordinall* publish'd in 1549. However, That this last mention'd, differs from the other two, is more than I can yield, till better inform'd. My Reasons are, (1st,) because neither the *Act* of Parliament, which confirms the *Ordinall* ^c, nor the Church where she speaks to this matter in her *Articles*, takes notice of any Alteration. I cite the *Act* of Parliament, because tho' it mentions Alterations in the *Common Prayer*, there is nothing said of any Difference in the *Ordinall*. (2dly,) *Mason* who liv'd in Queen *Elizabeth's* Reign, wrote upon this Argument, and one would think should know matter of *Fact*; This famous Defender of the English Clergy, asserts expressly, that the *Ring*, the *Pastoral Staff*, the *Oyl*, &c. were retrench'd in the *Reform'd Ordinall* ^d. That *Parker* was the first Archbishop consecrated by this *New Ordinall*: And that the same *Form* us'd in the Reign of *Edward VI.* and still retain'd in the Church of *England*, was observ'd at this Solemnity ^e.

^c 5, 6 *Edw. 6.* cap. 1. I thought them then the first Editions, but am now convinc'd there was an *Ordinall* publish'd in 1549. However, That this last mention'd, differs from the other two, is more than I can yield, till better inform'd. My Reasons are, (1st,) because neither the *Act* of Parliament, which confirms the *Ordinall* ^c, nor the Church where she speaks to this matter in her *Articles*, takes notice of any Alteration. I cite the *Act* of Parliament, because tho' it mentions Alterations in the *Common Prayer*, there is nothing said of any Difference in the *Ordinall*. (2dly,) *Mason* who liv'd in Queen *Elizabeth's* Reign, wrote upon this Argument, and one would think should know matter of *Fact*; This famous Defender of the English Clergy, asserts expressly, that the *Ring*, the *Pastoral Staff*, the *Oyl*, &c. were retrench'd in the *Reform'd Ordinall* ^d. That *Parker* was the first Archbishop consecrated by this *New Ordinall*: And that the same *Form* us'd in the Reign of *Edward VI.* and still retain'd in the Church of *England*, was observ'd at this Solemnity ^e. Now at *Parker's* Consecration the *Instrument* informs us in so many words, that there was no *Pastoral Staff* put into his Hands ^f. Thus the Reader may see if I was somewhat mistaken, I had good Authority for my excuse.

^f Nullum Archiepiscopo tradens Pastorale Baculum. Supplement to Morery's Dictionary. Article. Parker. Eccles. Hist. Vol. 2. p. 461. And here I make no scruple to confess, that the *Ordinall* in the *Common Prayer Book* printed by *Richard Grafton*, An. 1552, and now in the *Lambeth Library*, tho' it mentions nothing of putting the *Pastoral Staff* in the consecrated Bishop's Hand, nor that the Con-

secrating Bishops had this Mark of Authority in theirs; yet there is a *Manuscript* Marginal Note, for putting the *Pastoral Staff* into the consecrated Bishop's Hand: And this Note has a line struck through for Deletion.

Now, notwithstanding from this Deletion and the Print, we may certainly conclude this Ceremony was then omitted: However, this Marginal Hint seems to refer to a former Custom, and possibly to what was practis'd since the *Reformation*: But whether enjoyed by the *Ordinall* of 1549, is more than can be clearly infer'd.

But granting this Note refers to the *Ordinall* last mention'd, this Learned Prelate may lose by the concession another way: For the *Ordinall* printed by *Grafton* and *Whitchurch*, An. 1552, ⁸ tells us nothing of a *Chalice*, either with Bread in't, or without it, put into the *Priests* hand, neither is there any written Marginal Note to point towards any such Ceremony practis'd since the *Reformation*. Thus *Mason* is positive that no consecrated Plate was deliver'd to the Priest by the *Reform'd Ordinall* ^h. But this is affirm'd by our Learned *Historian* ⁱ. The circumstance related is wonderful. He tells us that by the Rubrick of the *Ordinall* printed 1549, the Bishop put the *Chalice with Bread in't*, into the *Priest's Hand* at his Ordination ^k. Now this Ceremony is altogether without precedent. 'Tis true, the Church of *Rome* for these last 6 or 700 Years have put the *Paten with Wafers* into the *Priest's Hand*; But that the *Chalice with Bread without Wine*, was given him at his Ordination, was never the custom of the *Ancient* or *Modern*, of the Greek or Latin, of the *Reform'd* or *Unreform'd Churches* ^l. Here therefore I must crave an Oyer of the *Record*; for till the *Book* appears, I cannot Resign.

After enquiry in other places, I saw this *Ordinall* in the *Lambeth Catalogue*. The Class, and Figures, are particularly mark'd: But upon a diligent search, neither the Number for Direction, nor the Book are to be found: 'tis therefore either lost, or much mislay'd. I'm sorry I miss'd succeeding, because 'twas Here the Bishop saw it lately, and Hither He appeals ^m.

I have waited several Weeks for this Book: And going again to *Lambeth*, I'm inform'd the Archbishop has taken it out of the Library into his Study: But an Accident having lately happen'd in his Family, 'twas not thought proper to trouble Him for a fight on't. Here I saw Dr. *Gibson's Codex Canonum*, &c. who referring to this *Ordinall*, mentions the *Pastoral Staff* put into the Bishop's Hand, and the *Chalice* with Bread, into the *Priest's*: Now if this Gentleman transcrib'd from the *Ordinall*, (which seems probable) and not from Bishop *Burnet's* Second Part of the *History* of the *Reformation*; I must own my self mistaken: supposing this, the Grounds I went upon, had strong appearances of Truth.

I confess the Doctor's making his References to 3 and 5 E. VI. is what I don't perfectly understand. For the first *Ordinall* was drawn in the 3d, and publish'd in *March*, when the 4th Year of this Reign was newly begun. In the 5th and 6th Year of this

⁸ In the Lambeth Library.

^h Mason. De Ministr. Anglic. ⁱ Bp. Burnet's Hist. Ref. Pt. II. p. 144. Pt. III. Pref. p. 4. ^k Bp. Burnet Ibid.

^l See my Eccles. Hist. Vol. II. p. 288, 289, 290.

^m Bp. Burnet. Hist. Ref. Pt. III. Pref. p. 5.

(87)

this Prince, the *Common-Prayer* Review'd was confirm'd by *Act* of Parliament, and printed by *Grafton* with the *Ordinall* annex, in which the Ceremonies above-mention'd are all omitted. But if the Dr's References are either mis-printed, or elsewhere explain'd, my doubt is so far satisfy'd. After all, inspecting the *Book* is the fullest Evidence. And here if the *View* happens to go against me, I can better afford to be somewhat mistaken than the Bishop. For granting him right in this Remark, he is plainly wrong in all the rest.

This Learned Prelate charges me with *changing a very material Word* in the *Rubrick* of the *Common Prayer* in *K. Edward's* time. The Design of this *Rubrick*, made at the *Review* of the *Liturgy*, was for explaining the Posture of Kneeling at the *Eucharist*, to an inoffensive Sence. And where lies the exceptionable Word? 'Tis in putting **Corporal Presence**, of *Christ's Natural Flesh and Blood*, instead of **Real and Essential**. This Alteration it seems brings up a very different Meaning, for the *Affertors* of *Transubstantiation*, neither do, nor can pretend, there's any such *Corporal Presence*: No; They affirm the Body is not present *Corporally*, but *Spiritually*, or as a Spirit is present. To this I answer, that notwithstanding it has so happen'd that *Corporal* is put instead of *Real* and *Essential*, this Change of the Terms is not at all *material*. Which I shall prove,

1st. From the *Rubrick* in *K. Edward's* Reign.

2^{dly}. From the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*.

1st. From the *Rubrick*. This *Direction*, as this Learned Prelate reports it, declares, That by *Kneeling* no *Adoration* is intended to any **Real and Essential Presence** of *Christ's Natural Flesh and Blood*. For the *Natural Body and Blood* of our Saviour are in *Heaven*, and not here: It being against the Truth of *Christ's Natural Body*, to be at one time in more places than one.

From hence 'tis plain, that **Real**, and **Essential**, and **Corporal Presence**, are Terms of an equivalent, and tantamount Sence. For the *Rubrick* informs us, there's no *Adoration* intended to the *Real and Essential Presence* of *Christ's Natural Flesh and Blood*. Why so? Because the *Natural Body and Blood* of our Saviour, are in *Heaven*, and not here: It being against the Truth of *Christ's Natural Body* to be at one time, in more places than one.

The *Rubrick* goes upon this Ground: Where our Saviour's *Natural Flesh and Blood*, are really and essentially present; they must be present in the *Essential Properties* of a Body. That is, to say nothing farther, They must have *partes extra partes*, be extended, and impenetrable: But such a *Presence*, the *Rubrick* tells us, is impossible, because 'tis against the Truth of *Christ's Natural Body*, to be at one time in more places than one. But if *Real*, *Essential* and **Corporal**, did not mean the same thing, 'twould not be against the Truth of *Christ's Natural Body*, to be at one time in more places than one: Because by this Construction, our Saviour's Body might be *Corporally* present only in one place, and yet at the same time be *Really* and *Essentially*, that is *Spiritually* present, at

the greatest Distances, which is plainly denyed by the *Rubrick*. Farther, as another Reason against *Adoration*, 'tis affirm'd, that the *Natural Body and Blood* of our Saviour, are in *Heaven* and not here: But if *Real*, *Essential* and **Corporal**, are not of the same Signification, in this *Rubrick*, what should hinder our Saviour's *Natural Body*, from being in *Heaven*, and here, at the same Instant? For considered with tangible Qualities, and the other Train of **Corporeity**, 'twas only in *Heaven*: And yet, under the Notion of an immaterial Privilege, and a *Spiritual Presence*, it might be on Earth at the same time. Besides, the *Rubrick* made in *Edward VI.* Reign, and that now used, give the same Reasons against *Adoration*; from whence it follows, that the *Real*, *Essential*, and **Corporal Presence**, must come under the same Meaning: For if the Manner of *Presence* denyed in one *Rubrick*, was different from that in the other, the same Reasons for prohibiting *Adoration* could not hold.

2^{dly}. By the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* the *Real*, *Essential* and *Corporal Presence* in the Holy *Eucharist*, are only different Words for the same Thing.

Thus *Philpot*, Archdeacon of *Winchester*, is pronounced an Heretick for denying the *Real*, that is the *Corporal Presence* of *Christ's Body and Blood* in the *Sacrament* of the *Altar*.

q Fox. p. 580.

Dr. *Humphreys*, amongst other things, complains, that upon *Q. Elizabeth's* Accession to the Throne, the *Article* in *K. Edward's* Reign of the *Spiritual Manducation*, which clearly contradicted the *Real Presence*, and gave a full Explanation of the true Doctrine, was now publish'd maim'd and dock'd.

r Bp. Burnet. Hist. Reformation. Pt. III. Records Book VI. Numb. 79.

Thus we see the *Spiritual Manducation*, and the *Real Presence*, are plainly oppos'd, and mention'd as Contradictions to each other. And does it not follow from hence, that in Dr. *Humphreys's* Opinion, the *Real* and *Corporal Presence* were no more than two Words for the same Meaning?

Lastly, Whereas this learned Prelate suggests the *Affertors* of *Transubstantiation* don't maintain a *Corporal Presence*; for this must be his Opinion, otherwise his Recital has no manner of Force in't: I shall prove from authentic Authorities, that the *Corporal Presence* has been the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, ever since the publick defining of *Transubstantiation*. And tho' I'm not ignorant, that some Members of that Church, affirm that our Saviour's Body, is not present *Corporally*, but *Spiritually*, or as a Spirit is present; yet we are not to take the Sence of a Communion from such private, unauthoriz'd Hands. To put this Matter out of doubt, (which one would have thought need not have been prov'd) I shall only give two or three undeniable Instances.

First, The Council at *Rome* under *Gregory VII* obliged *Berengarius* to recant in this Form, that by the mysterious Force of the Consecration, the Bread and Wine are truly, properly and substantially changed into the true, proper and quickening Body and Blood of our Lord *Jesus Christ*. And Archbishop *Landfrank*, in his Answer to *Berengarius*, comes up to the same Form, and speaks plainly for a *Corporal Presence*.

Anno Dom. 1078.

Secondly,

n Bp. Burnet. Pr. III. Pref. p. 5.

• Ibid.

An. Dom.
1215.

Concil.
Lab. and
Coffars. 10m.
XL

Offa &
Nervos.

* Catechism.
ad Paroch.
P. 189, 193.
Edit. Lugdun.

Ep. Burnet's
Hist. Ref.
Pt. iii.
Pref. p. 5.

Secondly, The famous Council of Lateran under Innocent III. maintains, "That in the Sacrament of the Altar, the Bread by the Divine Omnipotence is Transubstantiated into our Saviour's Body, and the Wine into his Blood; that for the completing the mysterious Union between Christ, and his Church, we may receive his Humane Nature, as he was pleas'd to take ours."

Now if the Council believed our Saviour's Humane Nature was received in this Sacrament, as He took ours, they must by consequence maintain the Corporal Presence in the strictest Notion.

I shall conclude this Matter with the *Catechismus ad Parochos*, drawn by a committee appointed by the Council of Trent, and standing on the Authority of that Synod.

This *Catechisme*, made for the Instruction of the Parish Priests, acquaints us, that by the Words of Consecration, "The True Body of our Saviour, that Body which was born of the Blessed Virgin, and sits at the Right Hand of the Father in Heaven, is present in this Sacrament. And to make the Orthodoxy of this Article more apparent, "The Parochial Clergy are put in Mind to cite our Saviour's Words in their Sermons, *This is my Body*, and explain them to a literal Sence.

"And Lastly, They are to inform their Audience, that whatever is included in the Essence and composition of a real Body, for Instance, *Bones and Nerves*", are contain'd and present in this Sacrament: They are farther to instruct their People, "That the whole Person of Christ, the Divine and Humane Nature, are join'd in this Mystery: That the most comprehensive Idea of both these Substances, and whatever is consequent to the Notion and Integrity of either of them; That is the Divinity, and entire Humane Nature; By which is to be understood, the Soul, the Blood, and all the parts of the Body: All this compass of Nature, Properties, and Parts, are to be believ'd present in the holy *Eucharist*". Now whether these Testimonies don't amount to more than a *Body's being spiritually present*, if there's any Sence in that Expression, I leave the Reader to judge.

There is one extraordinary Observation in this Paragraph, which must not be overlook'd. This Learned Prelate observes, *that the changing the Real and Essential, into the Corporal Presence, was chiefly procured by one D. P. G. soon after the Restoration of King Charles II. That the Person hinted by these Capitals, had a very extraordinary Subtlety for reconciling the Opinion of a Real Presence in the Sacrament, with the last words of the Rubrick. "That the Natural Body and Blood of Christ, were in Heaven, and not here, &c. And to what Expedient did He apply to bring these wonderful Things to a Consistency? Why he disengaged the Difficulty thus: A Body is in a Place, if there is no intermediate Body, but a Vacuum between it, and the Place. And He thought that by virtue of the words of Consecration, there was a Cylinder of a Vacuum between the Elements, and Christ's Body in Heaven; so that no Body being between, it was both in Heaven and in the Elements". By*

the way, this D. P. G. who was guilty of this solemn piece of Folly², must be no worse³ Ibid. Man than Dr. Peter Gunning: A Bishop of as great a Character for Learning, and Piety, as any then living in the Kingdom. As to the odd Manner of explaining this Mystery, I shall say nothing; But 'tis plain the Doctrine comes home to *Consubstantiation*. But that the famous Bishop Gunning was a Lutheran in this Point, is a Discovery I never heard of.

But let D. P. G. stand for whom you please; He must certainly be some Person of Figure, who had a Sway in the Convocation. Now I desire to know to what Purpose he solicited for this Alteration in the Rubrick? Upon what Motive did he procure the Change of the Real, or Essential, into the Corporal Presence? Did he suppose, tho' the Expression was altered, the Doctrine continued the same? If this was his Belief, what made him press for Amendments? To refine upon our First Reformers, can't well be done without something of Reflection: Constancy, as to Form and Opinions in an Ecclesiastical Legislature, is a recommending Circumstance, and argues a wise Settlement. This Person therefore must believe there was some strong Reason or Necessity for the Change; That is, He must suppose the Word Corporal comprehended a grosser Idea, and conveyed the Doctrine of *Trans*, or *Consubstantiation* with fuller Evidence, than Real, or Essential. Now if he believed the Term Corporal, delivered a different and bigger Meaning; what made him relinquish his own Alteration, and stick to the old Word Real? That he did so, is plain: For as this Learned Prelate assures us; He invented the Cylinder of a Vacuum, to reconcile the Opinion of the Real Presence with the last words of the Rubrick. But enough of this Matter; for by this time, I doubt not the Reader will see, that tho' a single Word was mistaken, the Sence remains perfectly the same.

But now at taking leave, I have a parting Blow. This Learned Prelate is pleas'd to say, *He should have a better Opinion of my Integrity, if I had professed my self not to be of his Communion, nor of the Communion of any other Protestant Church*^a. Had this Stroke been well Aim'd, the Smart would have been pretty sensible; but as it happens, the Mark is quite missed, and I feel no Pain about it. I'm afraid our Learned Historian has fallen a little into Cardinal Pole's Misfortune, that he turn'd his Mind mostly to Eloquence; for here's much more Declamation than Argument^b. Tho'^b Ep. Burnet's Hist. Ref. Pt. iii. p. 126. if I'm not mistaken, unless the Logick is True, the Eloquence must be False. For Rhetorick is nothing but Reason well Dress'd and Argument put into Order.

However, that the Reader mayn't trust too far to the Figure of the Title Page, and be misled by a solemn Authority, I shall endeavour to remove the Imputation. And here I shall be brief in the Recital, and refer to Volume and Page for Justification: To begin with the Pope's Supremacy; This claim is endeavoured to be disprov'd from the Stile of the first Council of Arles, ^c from the Council of Sardica, and the general Council of Ephesus; ^c Eccles. Hist. Vol. 1. p. 27, 8. From a Synod of the African Fathers in the Case

Case of *Apianus*; where they insist on their own Independance, and forbid Appeals to Transmarine Churches^d. From the *British* Churches, disowning *Austin* the Monk's pretences to Superiority, refusing Submission to Pope *Gregory the Great*; and from the Discourse between the Emperour *Constantius*, and *Liberius*^e.

Transubstantiation shew'd not to be the Doctrine of the *English Saxon Church*^f. The two famous Testimonies of St. *Chrysostom* and *Theodoret*, brought against it^g: The Antient *Greek Liturgies* cited to this purpose^h: And *Philpot's*, *Cheyney's*, and *Cranmer's* Argument mention'd with Approbationⁱ.

The *Hildebrandine* Claim of Temporal Power over Princes, together with the *Bulls* of Excommunication fulminated against King *Henry VIII*, and Queen *Elizabeth*, are censur'd with sufficient Dislike^k.

Giving the Laity the Holy Eucharist only under one kind, remark'd a Departure from the Practice of the Catholick Church, for more than a thousand Years together^l.

The Worship of Images prov'd an Innovation from the Testimonies of St. *Epiphanius* and Pope *Gregory the Great*^m; from the Councils of *Frankford*, and *Paris*; from the *Caroline Books*, and from the Remonstrance of the *English Church* at that time. Farther, The *Statutes* against the *Lollards*, the Executions upon Heterodoxy, whether real or pretended, and the Cruelties on the score of Religion in Queen *Mary's* Reign, are related as counter-methods to the Spirit of Christianity, and condemn'd, in the Case of *Priscillian* by the Antient Church: And that in *England*, as low as the Reign of *Edward III*. Imprisonment, and not *Burning*, was the Punishment for Hereticks Convictⁿ.

There is likewise an Endeavour to prove that *Prayers* in an unknown Tongue, are plain Deviations from *Scripture* and Antiquity^o.

And Lastly, 'Tis observ'd that the Council of *Trent's* setting *Scripture* and *Tradition* upon an equal Foot of Authority, and extending the Canon to the *Apocrypha*^p, has dissolv'd the Union of Christendom^q, and gone off from Catholick Tradition^r.

These, as far as I understand, are the main Points in Controversy: This Disagreement is the *Partition Wall* between the two Churches of *England* and *Rome*; this fixes the *Gulph*, and makes a Coalition impracticable. And which way a Man that defends the Reform'd Side of all these Questions, can be fairly charg'd with *Popery*, is wholly beyond my Comprehension.

But it may be I have run my self upon Contradictions; pull'd down what I have built, disclaim'd *Popery* in one Part, and maintain'd it in another. I confess such Miscarriages are not without Example. Some celebrated *Writers* have fallen into Misfortunes of this kind. However, I challenge any Man to prove me guilty of any such Inconsistency, in either of the *Volumes*; or that I have asserted so much as a single Proposition insinuated in the *Charge*, either on the Heads above-mentioned, or any other.

I'm sensible some People count the Government and Practice of the Primitive Church,

and the decent Solemnities in Divine Worship, Remains of *Popery*. I own my self by no Means inclined to these Modern Extremities. To oppose every Thing believ'd and practis'd in the Church of *Rome*, is little less than Distraction. At this rate, we must throw away the *Creed*, and the *Bible*. And as King *James I*. argued against the *Dissenters*, *The Papists wear Shoes and Stockings, therefore we must go Bare-foot*^s.

To return, If the arguing on the *Reformation* Side in the Points above-mention'd, are sufficient Discharges of Imputations towards *Popery*, I hope I may have given Satisfaction, especially considering there's no clashing, or falling foul of one Place upon another.

But if 'tis farther required I should have strain'd Ambiguities to the hardest Construction, made tragical Representations, and deliver'd my self in rough Language without Decency or Ground; that I should have bestow'd some warm Periods to exaggerate Matters, to heighten Differences, and widen the Breaches in the Catholick Church: If 'twas my Business to foment a Spirit of ill Nature, to enflame Animosities, and exasperate one Division of Christians against another: That I should have given, some loud repeated Warnings to secure a *Quarter*, where the *Garrison* is always upon Duty, and the *Place* sufficiently fortified: That I should have conjur'd up *Mormoes*, founded an Alarm against imaginary Dangers, and made People Fear, where no Fear is: That I should have battered a Party, watched by a general Dislike, inoffensive by want of Numbers, and disabled from making Disturbance, tho' never so willing: If 'tis expected I should have told some formidable Stories, (with the Proof quite out of sight,) to destroy the Confidence between Christian Princes of a different Communion^s; to make *Treaties* Impracticable, and maim all publick Correspondence: Tho' if such Relations should give an Impression, 'twould serve only to make the *States* of Christendom regardless of each others Interest, and disinclined to mutual Defence. 'Twould afford the *Infidels* an Opportunity to invade the *Pale*, and destroy the *Plantations* of the Apostles; To take down the *Cross*, and set up the *Crescent*, and leave the *Mussulmen* and *Free-Thinkers* to scramble for the World. In fine, If 'tis a fault not to have spent some Declamation upon these Heads, If silence upon these Topicks are reckon'd an omission, I must own my self guilty, and, which is somewhat more, I never intend to repent.

And now having gone through the Objections in his *Preface*, I should have stop'd here; had there not been two Passages in his *History*, in which I may be something concern'd.

This Learned *Historian* bears hard upon *Cavendish's* Memory, taxes him with misreporting the Battle of *Pavia*, from thence concludes, he is little to be depended on, and owns withal, he has followed him too implicitly in his former Work^t.

I shan't examine at present, whether *Cavendish* and *Guicciardine* agree in this Relation: Let it be granted, the First may be somewhat in the Wrong; granting this, the Inference is by no means conclusive; For how does it

C

^s Conference at Hampton-Court.

^s Bp. Burnet's Hist. Ref. Part III. p. 257.

^t Bp. Burnet's Hist. Ref. Pt. III. p. 38.

^d Id. p. 32, 33, 6. Id. p. 76, 7.

^e Id. Vol. II. p. 612.

^f Id. Vol. I. p. 204, 6.

^g Id. p. 262.

^h Id. Vol. II. p. 260.

ⁱ Id. p. 356, 7, 8, 368.

^k Id. p. 98, 153, 263.

^l Id. Vol. I. p. 480, 1.

^m Id. p. 65, 6, 139, 140, 141.

ⁿ Id. Vol. I. p. 616, 17.

^o Id. Vol. II. p. 382, 397.

^p Id. Pref. p. 5.

^q Conc. Trid. Sess. iv. Decret. de Canon. Scriptur.

^r Eccles. Hist. Vol. II. Prefat. p. 4.

^s Id. Vol. II. p. 895.

^t Id. Vol. II. p. 253, to 255.

follow from his misrelating a Battle almost a Thousand Miles distant, that he is not to be depended on for Matters of Fact in the Family where he liv'd, and with which he may reasonably be supposed to be thoroughly acquainted? *Carvendish* who wrote *Woolsey's Life*, was a Man of Birth, employ'd upon the greatest Occasions, and this Cardinal's intimate *Domestick* through the whole Course of his Great-

See *Memoirs of Cardinal Woolsey*.

ness to his Death. As for his writing upon *Memory*, as this Learned Prelate affirms, there's no manner of Proof of his being no better furnish'd: On the contrary, his reciting his Master's Speeches and Discourses to a considerable length, his tracing the Cardinal's Fortune Step by Step, his giving the detail of Occurrences with so much Particularity and Circumstance, both with respect to Time and other Things; these are strong Indications he wrote upon *Memoires*, and probably the Cardinal's, as well as his own. Having sometimes cited this Gentleman's Book, I thought my self obliged to do him this Justice.

Our Learned *Historian* affirms 'tis plain, the 42 *Articles*, said in the Title to have been agreed on by Bishops and other learned Men in the Synod of London, Ann. 1552, did not pass in Convocation. Against this Assertion he raises an Objection: And confesses, that in the first Convocation under Queen Mary, the Prolocutor Weston charged Philpot, That a Catechism was put forth without their consent. To this Philpot answered on the suddain, That the House had granted an Authority to make Ecclesiastical Laws, to certain Persons to be appointed by the King's Majesty. And that what was set forth by them, might well be said to be done in the Synod of London, altho' the House had no Notice thereof before the Promulgation.

Bp. Burnet's Hist. Ref. Part. III. pag. 210, 11.

Id. p. 211. See Fox.

To this the Learned Prelate replies, That this Answer was made on the suddain; that Philpot did not consider that the Convocation had not agreed to any such Deputation of 32 Persons seized by Act of Parliament.

Bp. Burnet, Ibid.

To this it may be return'd, 1st, it does not appear that Philpot's Answer was suddain, or that he ever retracted it.

2^{dly}, This Learned Author seems to have overlook'd the Force of Philpot's Argument. He does not insinuate the Deputation consisted of 32 Persons, and went upon the Authority of an Act of Parliament; for as Bishop Burnet rightly observes, this Parliamentary Provision has no relation to Matters of Doctrine, but only to Discipline, Canon Law, and the Process of the Ecclesiastical Courts; whereas the *Articles* charg'd upon Philpot were a System of Belief. And why might not the Convocation appoint a Committee for drawing *Articles* of this Nature?

This Learned Prelate argues farther, that *Cranmer* disowns the settling the Title, and grants the Book of *Articles* to be his Doings: That is, he had a Hand in the Direction and Drawing. But that the Book was his single Performance, can't be inferred from the Expression, and is clearly contradicted by Philpot; who informs us, that Bishop Ridley, and some other Divines, had a share in drawing up the *Catechism*.

Collier's Eccles. Hist. Vol. II. p. 355. from Journal. Convoc.

Now that the *Articles* were comprehended under the Title of the *Catechism*, is suppos'd by this Prelate, and might

be farther prov'd by several Reasons too long to insert.

Convoc. Id. p. 368.

And Lastly, we may remember, Philpot was Archdeacon of Winchester, a Member of the Convocation of Course, and in all likelyhood, spoke from his own Knowledge. He was besides his Learning, a Person of Integrity, Constancy, and Courage; and therefore if there should be any difference (which is more than appears) between this Gentleman's Relation and *Cranmer's*, the Testimony of the Archdeacon must be allow'd to be altogether as unexceptionable as the Archbishop's: To which may be added the Learned Heylin's Observation, That those *Articles* were received as the Doctrine of the Church of England, for the first five Years of Queen Elizabeth's Reign. That is, till they were review'd, and somewhat alter'd by the Convocation in 1562. Now had they been the Work of a single Hand, 'tis not likely their Authority would have run so high, and that they should have pass'd so long for the Belief of a National Church.

Heylin. Hist. Ref. p. 121, 2.

And which is a farther Confirmation, this Learned Prelate reports from an Abstract of the Convocation-Book, that the Prolocutor declared to the Upper House, that the *Articles* set forth IN A SYNOD in King Edward's Time, were now before a Committee, to be consider'd, and if need was, to be corrected by them; whence it seems to follow, that this Lower House of Convocation believ'd the *Articles* of 1552 were pass'd with the Assent of a Synod.

Bp. Burnet's Hist. Refor. Part. III. p. 301.

And now having nothing farther with our Learned *Historian*, I must next consider some few Things observ'd upon both my Volumes by Bishop Nicholson. This Reverend Prelate in his *English Historical Library*, tho' he offers to disprove nothing, yet by the manner of his Recital, 'tis plainly his Meaning to give the Reader a Prejudice; and point to an unfriendly Construction of the Passages produced. He begins with taking Notice, that the Critical Reader will be apt to observe some special Respects, occasionally paid to the Bishops of Rome.

English Hist. Library, p. 117.

I wish he had told us what these special Respects are. It seems they don't lye open to common View. A Man must be a critical Reader, and furnish'd with more than ordinary Sagacity, to discover them. But I han't rail'd on the Pope: That's true: To treat a Bishop and a Prince with course Language, had been a failure both in Decency and Religion. But I have sometimes call'd him his Holiness, and so does the *London Gazetteer*, it may be, more than once every Week. And what more harm is there in this, than in calling the Kings of France and Spain, the Most Christian and Catholick?

This Learned Prelate says, I insinuate that most of the Modern erroneous Doctrines of the Roman Church were maintain'd here in the Saxon Times. How can I help it if they were? Am I answerable for the Belief of the English Saxon Church One Thousand Years since?

Ibid.

I have produced unquestionable Authorities for what is reported upon this Head, and that's enough. Besides, I have given Instances in these Papers, that some Doctrines now held in the Church of Rome, were not maintain'd here in the Saxon Times: And the Reader

Reader may see more in the Preface to my first Volume.

Ibid.

² Eccles. Hist. Vol. I. p. 297.

The next Remark for Disadvantage, is my affirming Archbishop *Anselm* held the right Side of the Question in the Dispute with the King about owning Pope *Urban II.* I have given good Reasons for this Assertion, and am still of the same Opinion. But that *Anselm's* Behaviour in this Contest with *William Rufus*, was becoming a Prelate of his fervent Zeal, and invincible courage, as Bishop *Nicholson* suggests, is more than I have affirmed.

¹ English Hist. Library, Ibid.

¹ Eccles. Hist. Vol. I. p. 375.

For another Fault (for every Passage quoted, must be suppos'd such) 'tis related that *Bec- ket's* Conduct toward *Henry II.* was also Innocent, as to any practice against the Crown; the Man having acted all along upon a Principle of Sincerity^h. But here's a misrecital: I don't speak so decisively as this comes to: My Words are these, "As to any practice against the Crown, he SEEMS Innocent enough. "And he SEEMS all along to have acted on a Principle of Sincerityⁱ. As for the Grounds of this fair Construction they are reported at large, and ought to have been disprov'd before the passing a Censure: But some critical Readers, I perceive, are apt to do strange Things.

¹ English Hist. Libr. Ibid.

¹ Eccles. Hist. Vol. I. p. 547.

But *Edward III's* Letter to the Pope (concerning Provisions) is said to misrepresent matter of Fact: Since under the Saxon Heptarchy, the English Bishops were not (as is there asserted) Creatures of the Crown^k. To this I answer, There's a Salvo for the King's Honour premis'd to this Remark^l: And after this due Regard, what Crime is it to shew a Prince, or rather his Ministers, may be mistaken in Point of History? Who ever heard of an Infallible King? And where the Mistake is not a little unserviceable to the Christian Religion, I conceive an Historian oblig'd to discover it: And that his Majesty was misinform'd about Matter of Fact, is made good from several Instances of undeniable Authority^m.

^m Id. Vol. I. p. 548.

This Learned Prelate having done with my First Volume, passes on to the Second.

ⁿ English Hist. Libr. p. 117, 18.

And here he begins his Complaint, that *Luther* and *Calvin*, *Knox* and *Fox*, are charg'd with Mistakes and Misbehaviour; that *Luther* is represented as one upon the Verge of Disfranchisementⁿ. But these are Bishop *Nicholson's* Words, not mine. And as for this German Divines raising civil Disturbances in the Empire, breaking the Chains of the Canon Law, and going too great a length towards the other Extream; There's nothing deliver'd as my own Opinion; I only report what King *Henry VIII.* and *Thomas Muncer*, lay to his Charge^o. 'Tis true, I blamed *Luther* for great Indecencies, and failing extravagantly in the Regards due to a Crown'd Head; but this was no more than the Case required. This Reformer afterwards recollected himself, ask'd the King's Pardon, and offer'd a Recantation^p. And would this Reverend Prelate have had these material Passages suppress'd? Reparation to the King's Honour unrelated? and *Luther's* Repentance conceal'd?

^o Eccles. Hist. Vol. II. p. 21, 2.

^p Ibid. Eccles. Hist. Vol. II. p. 21.

Calvin, not to mention his outraging our Queen *Mary*, and calling her *Proserpine*, held a

Correspondence with that Incendiary *Knox*, caresses his Insults of the Government, and congratulates his Success^q. *Beza* closes with ¹ Calvin Epist. *Knox* in the same Principles, writes with equal Warmth, and pushes the suppressing Episcopacy in a bitter Strain^r.

^r Beza Epist.

'Tis true, Queen *Elizabeth* supported the Scots against their Sovereign, and assisted in some of these Commotions; but then she was a young Princess, and advis'd to these early Hostilities by her Council. They told her, the sending Troops against the Queen of Scots, was no more than Self-defence: That the landing Forces at *Leith* had made that Side the Aggressors: That the French design'd the Conquest of the Island, and that our Queen had no Way to preserve her Dominions, but by being beforehand^s.

^s Bp. Burnet's Hist. Reform. Part III. Records, Book VI, Numb. 54.

Whether the Politicks were overstrained in this Advice, whether these Precautions were justifiable or not, is more than I shall determine; However, at the worst, they were not without Face and Colour. But what Authority could *Knox* draw from this foreign Precedent? What pretence had this Divine to preach up an Insurrection? To lead on the People to the last Disorders of Ravage, Plunder, and Sacrilege^t? Those who know the Scottish Constitution, and read their Acts of Parliament, will find such Sallies as those plainly unwarrantable. In fine, false Principles, short Learning, flaming Heat, and extravagant Assurance, are part of *Knox's* Character; And I am sorry Matter of Fact will make it no better.

^t Spotswood.

As for *Fox*, his Temper is somewhat better govern'd, and I'm willing to believe him a Man of Probity. What he cites from Registers and Records, I find no Reason to question. But then, as Bishop *Burnet* observes, he might be too credulous in Writing such Things as were brought him by Report^v. However, he was not a Person of the deepest Penetration. The rough usage himself and his Friends met with under Queen *Mary*, seems to have sow'd his Humour and given him a Byass. Thus his Zeal sometimes gets the better of his Judgment, and transports him to indefensible Conduct.

^v Bp. Burnet's Hist. Ref. Part III. Append. p. 394.

To sum up this Matter in a Word or two. Upon *Luther* I shall observe nothing farther; but as to *Calvin* and the rest, their Reputation has not been serviceable in some Respects; neither have their Writings had any kind Effect upon the Repose of Christendom. What harm is it then to report their failings, and prevent their doing mischief after they are dead? These Reformers being right in many Things, and Men of a rais'd Character, makes their Authority the more dangerous when they miscarry. Why then should their Memory be privileg'd from Censure where they deserve it? Why should practical Errors, and unprimitive Conduct, lie cover'd and conceal'd? No benevolent Spirit in the other World, will thank an Author for such Ceremony as this. Unless I am much mistaken, 'tis the Business of an Historian to mark Popular Mistakes, to keep his Reader from being surpriz'd with Names of Credit, and swallowing Diet and Poison together: Unless the Rocks and Sands are discover'd,

ver'd, the Ships which sail that Way, may possibly strike, and be lost.

To proceed. King Charles II. has a short Commendation, tho' not without some Alloy. ^{* Eccles. Hist. Vol. II. p. 904.} But even this is disrelish'd by the Reverend Prelate. ^{* English Hist. Libr. p. 118.} He seems unwilling a good Word should be given this Prince's Memory; and yet it can't be denied, the Three Nations flourish'd through his Reign, and were left in Peace and Plenty. But he takes check at my saying, this King died with the Faction at his Feet. With submission, a discontented Party that gave broad Signs of arresting the Government, and rising upon the Laws, may fairly be call'd a Faction: And these were the People his Majesty had reduced at his Death; But how long they lay afterwards in this disabled Posture, and whether they recover'd or not, was beyond my Period to examine.

This Reverend Prelates last Observation, is surprizing beyond the rest. *What Views soever, says he, the Author might have at his first setting out, 'tis manifest that in this second Volume, his Business is to compromise Differences between the Churches of England and Rome; and to establish (on the Authority of our two Universities) a Fundamental Hereditary Right of Succession to the Crown, supported by Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance.*

In answer to compromising Differences between the Churches of England and Rome, I need add nothing more than what has been already offer'd on this Head.

As for Passive Obedience, as the Constitution stood then, I think there's somewhat more produced, than the Authority of the Universities. ^{* Eccles. Hist. Vol. II. p. 903. Marg.} But as to Hereditary Right, &c. there's nothing establish'd, nor any Opinion interpos'd. And tho' I thought it the Business of an Historian to give the Reader what pass'd upon critical Occasions, and report the Judgment of others; I have endeavour'd to stand clear of Politicks my self: And thus I have omitted a Detail of some Occurrences, on purpose to decline State-Controversy, and prevent Misconstruction.

Besides, Non-Resistance is no incommunicable Privilege, not *proprium quarto modo* to Hereditary Title: Elective Monarchies, and Common Wealths, may bind the Subject as close

as this comes to. The Roman Empire was elective, and yet the *Lex Regia* made the Prince absolute; Neither do we find any Reservations for the People to redress their Grievances by Force. And I believe it would be some difficulty to produce a legal Warrant in the Government of Venice or Holland, for the Subjects to levy an Army, and call the Magistracy to an Account. I confess I never heard of any express Liberty, and publick Provision, made for this purpose, unless in the Charters of Andrew the Second, King of Hungary, ^{a Thuan. Count Teckley's Life.} and John King of England ^{b Math. Paris}. And in this latter Instrument, there was a Clause of Security for the Crown. 1st, The Barons were not to hurt the King's Person, or any of his Children. And 2^{dly}, When they had made themselves Reparation, for what had been suffer'd, they were to return to their Allegiance as before. Thus we see Passive Obedience may be claim'd by every Species of Government, and therefore can be no peculiar Support to Hereditary Right. And why the First should be charg'd as a Principle to establish the Latter, is not easily accounted for. I can't forbear saying, the Tacking these Two together for such significant Service, is extraordinary Justice! And that the Force and Friendliness of all his Observations are equally remarkable.

POSTSCRIPT.

April 2. 1715.

BY the favour of a Gentleman uncommonly well furnish'd with Curiosities of the Press, I have at last gotten a sight of the Ordinal, Printed Anno. 1549. Upon perusal, I find the Bible laid on the Bishop's Neck, the Pastoral Staff put in his Hand, and the Chalice with Bread in it, for the Priest, some of the Consecrating, and Ordaining Ceremonies.

E L N I S.

